

UNITED WISDOM

What are we disagreeing about—and who gets to be heard?

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-10-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

What are we disagreeing about—and who gets to be heard?

Epigraph

> *an equable opportunity*

John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, Chapter VII, fragment of the author's sentence about interaction among members of a group.

What this article is about

In a fictional story, residents of a small apartment building discuss a Saturday meeting. Anna proposes moving it to the evening: she works during the day and cannot attend. Dmitry replies that the morning suits most people. He may be right about the majority. But Anna is trying to say something else too: the schedule is always settled before people occupied during the day are consulted. When the benefits of a morning meeting are explained again, she hears a refusal to acknowledge the possibility of her participation. An argument about timing becomes an argument about who counts as a participant in a shared decision.

The questions are connected, but differ. A proposal can be rejected without depriving its author of a voice. You can listen at length and still disagree. You can offer someone a turn to speak while allowing their words to change nothing, even in your understanding of the task. This article considers the distinction between the substance of disagreement and the opportunity to be heard: how to avoid buying attention with agreement, replacing examination of arguments with a struggle for recognition, and overlooking the conditions of a conversation. It concerns ethical participation, rather than a universal legal entitlement to speak anywhere. Where threats or coercion are present, joint discussion is not prescribed as mandatory.

I. An answer may address the wrong question

A conversation can contain two requests at once. The first concerns a decision: change the time, abandon a purchase, reconsider a plan. The second concerns someone's position in the discussion: let them finish, refrain from assigning a motive, consider the experience affected. An answer to the first request does not necessarily answer the second. Saying that a proposal is unsuitable does not explain why its author was prevented from presenting its grounds. Conversely, attentive consideration does not make a proposed solution suitable. Both distinctions matter; otherwise every disagreement will resemble expulsion.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

In our hypothetical scene, Anna can acknowledge that evenings are difficult for several families. That does not require her to accept the way the time was chosen as fair. Dmitry can consider a morning meeting best while asking which constraints he overlooked. A third possibility emerges alongside winning and losing: remain divided about the result while understanding the decision's subject more accurately. A recording, another meeting, or a different way to submit views may be needed. None of these possibilities promises to satisfy everyone.

To distinguish the questions, it helps to name a specific action rather than only a general feeling. A person may have been denied a turn, interrupted, or told in advance that their experience is irrelevant. These are different events. Saying that nobody listens can describe any of them, or mean that what was heard was not accepted. Clarification does not devalue the experience; it reveals which answer is needed. Otherwise an argument about a proposal will endlessly serve a task that nobody has named.

There is a counterexample too: someone received time, their argument was restated accurately, available information was checked, and the decision stayed the same. Lack of agreement alone does not establish lack of listening. Perhaps the reasons are insufficient; perhaps other constraints apply; perhaps the outcome remains unfair. That last judgment needs grounds of its own. The opportunity to be heard matters because it should not depend on winning, but it does not turn every unsuccessful proposal into proof that its author was humiliated.

II. A voice should not be bought with the correct answer

A group may have an unspoken condition of participation: first accept the common assessment, then explain your position. Someone who disagrees is treated as an obstacle to be put in order, rather than a source of information. Their words are examined only after a preliminary decision about whether the speaker is acceptable. Convenient participants receive attention; inconvenient ones are told why they should have phrased things differently. Sometimes the form really does hinder discussion, but agreement need not become payment for consideration of the issue raised.

In Chapter VII of *Democracy and Education*, Dewey connects the quality of associated life with varied shared interests and free exchange of experience; one-sided interaction limits participants. This is a philosophy of education and society, rather than a tested technique for a family argument or a current legal standard. The application here concerns conditions of participation alone. If a discussion admits only experience that is convenient in advance, it loses information about the group's own life. That formulation does not mean every proposal must be approved.

In our fictional story, Dmitry tells Anna that residents should support the building committee before discussing dissatisfaction. Supporting shared work may matter, but it does not answer the question about scheduling. If attention is offered only after a display of loyalty, the dispute already concerns access to a participant's role. Anna can make the reverse mistake too: declare that anyone favouring the morning disrespects working people. A substantive argument then becomes a test of belonging to the correct side, and the demand for agreement simply changes hands.

Free participation does not require a conversation without any structure. People may limit time, choose a subject, decline insults, or acknowledge that they cannot continue now. What matters is the connection between a limit and a clear task, rather than the requirement to accept a conclusion beforehand. If one person speaks for ten minutes and another gets thirty seconds because their position is unwelcome, the form protects a preference. If everyone is offered an accessible way to present one specific question, a limit may help. Accessibility needs consideration in context, rather than one attractive rule.

III. Understanding is not a hidden form of agreement

Listening can be difficult when understanding another person's meaning feels as though it will be taken as surrender. Someone begins objecting before grasping what is proposed. They defend their conclusion against the very existence of another perspective. Yet you can understand a proposal accurately and still reject it. You can acknowledge someone's experience as real for them without confirming their explanation of its causes. These possibilities leave room for disagreement without an obligatory caricature of the other person. They do not require treating all accounts as equally reliable.

Anna explains that morning discussions prevent her from influencing shared matters. Dmitry can restate the difficulty: the chosen time excludes your participation in this meeting. That does not assert that morning meetings are forbidden, that he deliberately excluded her, or that evenings will solve the problem. It checks the meaning of a specific difficulty. If Anna corrects him, the subject becomes more precise. If she agrees, they may still disagree about the solution. The step's value is limited to understanding; agreement with a restatement creates no obligation to concede the result.

Confirming a feeling also differs from confirming a fact. You can hear that someone feels abandoned without declaring deliberate abandonment established. The announcement's date, the message's accessibility, and the process for choosing a time can be checked. Another person's motive cannot be verified from a facial expression alone. Sometimes distinguishing observation from assumption makes a conversation less accusatory, but this article promises no such effect. The listener may reject the proposed wording. That is neither a diagnosis of their readiness for dialogue nor grounds for declaring their next answer pointless in advance.

Understanding has a limit: it does not require justifying a threat or enduring humiliation to produce an accurate restatement. You can understand a demand to declare harm acceptable and refuse it. Attention to meaning does not grant unlimited access to your time. A brief question about the task of listening can therefore help: am I trying to understand an argument, check an event, or earn permission to end the conversation? The last possibility indicates a different situation. This article offers no exercise for obtaining approval from someone who holds you through threats.

IV. Observation and a verdict on character need different grounds

The more recognition matters, the more easily a dispute moves from an action to a complete description of a person. Lateness becomes proof of indifference, a short answer of arrogance, a different assessment of a lack of conscience. Repeated actions sometimes support serious conclusions, but one episode does not contain an entire life. Clarification does not require abandoning judgments about harm. It requires showing which fact you are assessing and where you begin assuming its meaning. Otherwise a response can only defend the whole personality, while the particular task remains unexamined.

In paragraph 45 of Epictetus's *Enchiridion*, translated by Elizabeth Carter, describing an observed action is distinguished from judging prematurely. This is a Stoic discipline of judgment, rather than a modern method of diagnosing intentions. Only the boundary between what happened and what we added is useful here. It neither removes evident danger nor requires understanding a motive before seeking protection. Other strong Stoic claims about harm do not become grounds for denying actual damage.

At the hypothetical meeting, Anna can say that three announcements appeared after the time was settled. That claim can be checked. The conclusion that the committee regards her as a second-class person needs other grounds. Dmitry can address a verifiable event without requiring her to abandon all feelings first. Anna can retain her assessment without presenting it as recorded minutes. Such precision leaves each person room to correct an error without declaring themselves an entirely good or bad participant.

The language of facts can become avoidance too. If someone describes repeated exclusion, answering only about one inaccurate date does not address their full thought. Correcting a detail does not automatically refute a pattern; a pattern does not remove the need to check details. Listening includes both movements. You can request one example and then return to what it is meant to show. If the conversation becomes permanently stuck on a single slip, clarification starts serving as a way to keep the question out of discussion.

V. An opportunity to speak needs a connection to the task

Someone can be given a microphone after a decision is final, and that can be called participation. Sometimes later feedback does matter: it allows consequences to be checked or the next process to change. But its limits should then be named honestly. If the outcome is closed, shared choice cannot be promised. If a person speaks only for the record, that is not necessarily participation in the decision. An opportunity to utter words differs from an opportunity to contribute information to the question considered, even when both appear equally polite.

In our fictional story, the meeting time is already printed on invitations, but the recurring way of choosing it can still change. Dmitry can explain present constraints without pretending everything will start again. Anna can ask where her view can matter: this meeting, the next one, or only a record of objections. The answer need not be pleasant, but should correspond to the actual state of affairs. Recognition of participation then stops depending on a performance of open discussion in which nothing is available for reconsideration.

This does not mean every disagreement requires another vote. A particular decision may have responsible people, agreed procedures, and resource constraints. Their validity and legal meaning cannot be established by an article. The narrower ethical question is whether people know who decides, what is open, and what contribution is possible. If authority to decide is confused with authority to declare someone else's experience nonexistent, unnecessary power appears. You can be responsible for an outcome while acknowledging that it affects people who neither chose nor approved it.

Some situations concern personal choice: what to buy for yourself, whom to meet, which recreation to prefer. Another person may be affected by consequences without every question becoming jointly owned. Hearing their concern does not transfer control of your life to them. Mutual influence calls for distinguishing shared matters from personal decisions. Without that boundary, a demand to be heard can become a demand for a veto. Protecting one person's voice then deprives another of autonomy, despite beginning with language about mutual respect.

VI. Listening does not oblige you to continue every conversation

Ethical attention is not unlimited availability. Someone may lack time, energy, sufficient knowledge, or readiness to discuss the question now. A particular forum may have another purpose. A limit can be named honestly without declaring the other person unworthy of attention. But its wording needs to match the intention: if no conversation is planned, a promise to return should not serve as a convenient delayed refusal. The detailed distinction between a pause and a refusal is a separate subject; here, a voice does not require a listener's endless presence.

In James 1:19–22, in the Updated World English Bible, attention to hearing appears alongside caution in speech and anger, followed by acting on the received word. This is religious teaching, rather than a universal protocol for listening to every demand. It allows a limited examination of one's haste to answer. It establishes no duty to endure threats, concede an argument, or guarantee that attentive speech will bring peace. The substance of faith cannot be wholly replaced with a secular communication technique.

In our story, Anna may be unable to discuss the matter on the stairs when she is rushing to work. Dmitry may have no answer until he checks the schedule. Either can name that limit without describing the other as oversensitive or incapable of understanding. If further discussion is genuinely intended, it helps to identify an available subject and a point of return. If it is not, an honest refusal may be more accurate than an indefinite promise. Declining a particular conversation does not establish that the issue raised does not exist.

Where threats, control, or fear of a reaction are present, ordinary exchange of arguments may be inappropriate. The British NHS recommends seeking support with domestic abuse and control; immediate danger requires local emergency help. Local availability and the British page's links have not been checked here. The article does not make a joint exercise or disclosure of sensitive information a condition of dignity. An opportunity to be heard must not become a duty to face danger again to obtain a carefully worded answer.

VII. Reciprocity does not mean mathematically identical minutes

Equal speaking time looks like a simple solution: five minutes each, no interruptions. Sometimes it helps establish access, but does not ensure the same opportunity to express a question. One person already knows the documents; another sees them for the first time. One speaks easily before a group; another needs a written response or clarification of terms. These are hypothetical differences, rather than diagnoses of ability. Fair participation cannot be measured entirely by a stopwatch. What matters is what someone can convey, how it will be understood, and where it goes.

At the fictional meeting, Anna can be offered written comments, but only if written participation is actually considered. If her letter is filed unread, the channel is decorative. If Dmitry receives advance information while others learn the conditions at the vote, identical minutes do not remove the difference in preparation. These circumstances deserve attention without an immediate conclusion about conspiracy. Habit or organisation may be changeable; the group may also be unwilling to change. This article promises no desired outcome.

Conversely, a demand to equalise every condition completely can make a decision impossible. Not every conversation offers ideal access, and not every limit represents deliberate exclusion. Available changes and remaining difficulties can be named. You can check whether someone received information and can correct an inaccurate restatement. You can acknowledge that a proposed format does not suit them. An honest limit differs from declaring an existing form automatically equal for everyone simply because it uses identical words in a common invitation.

Reciprocity also concerns the speaker's listening. If Anna demands attention to her constraints while dismissing the experience of families with small children beforehand, the shared question narrows again. This is no reason to deny her a voice; it is a reason to bring another affected experience into the discussion. Participation need not become a contest to be the only invisible person. Several incompatible constraints can be real at once. Acknowledging them has not yet found a solution, but has already stopped explaining every other argument as a lack of concern for your life.

VIII. Witnesses need not become judges

Before other people, a request to be heard may gain another meaning: the speaker needs witnesses to see their position. Sometimes that matters for support or examination of a common process. But an audience can change the task: participants begin defending reputations instead of answering a proposal. One fears appearing weak, another ungrateful, and a third cheers for their side. Notice whom the words now address and what response is expected. Not every appeal to witnesses is pressure; not every display of public politeness represents attention.

In our story, Dmitry may acknowledge privately that announcements are late, then reduce the issue to Anna's whim before the neighbours. His understanding and his public restatement differ. Anna need not prove herself right to the whole building to name that discrepancy. She can clarify one fact and the subject of one request. But the possibility depends on circumstances. If a group responds with humiliation or threats, the article does not propose testing it through greater openness. The suitability of a support channel cannot be determined from the number present alone.

Public discussion does not grant unrestricted access to private information either. Explaining a scheduling difficulty does not always require revealing details of work, health, or family. Someone can name a constraint to the extent available, while the group acknowledges an incomplete picture. That does not make every unsupported demand mandatory. It distinguishes sufficient information about a task from the desire to investigate the applicant's entire life. Some decisions do require documents; their necessity and assessment belong to a particular situation, rather than being established by this article.

A witness's help can also be modest. They need not announce the winner or explain either person's motives. Sometimes it is enough to return to an interrupted question, request correction of an inaccurate restatement, or recall which outcome remains possible. These actions are no universal mediation and do not guarantee a changed decision. Their meaning is confined to participation's conditions. When spectators stop distributing moral titles, the substance can be considered again. Nobody should take this role under threat or against their willingness.

IX. An objection remains an objection after recognition

A conversation sometimes ends with more accurate understanding and the same disagreement. Anna is heard, but the meeting stays in the morning. Dmitry understands the difficulty but considers a change impossible this week. That may be an insufficient result; the article need not call it good. What matters is that participation's quality and the decision's quality are assessed separately. Once the meaning is heard, reasons, consequences, or the process can be disputed without again having to prove the speaker exists. Each subject gains grounds of its own for assessment.

Recognition does not demand gratitude for a refusal either. Someone may regard the result as unfair and seek another appropriate route to participation. But a precise conversation helps identify what must be challenged: a fact, prediction, allocation of resources, or authority. A general statement about disrespect may be necessary at first, but seldom describes all the subsequent work. Nor should perfect wording become an entry requirement. An imperfectly expressed question can be heard without confirming every accusation that accompanied its arrival.

At the fictional meeting's end, Anna and Dmitry can record two different things: the next meeting's time has not changed; future scheduling will be discussed with people unable to attend mornings. This is not proof of harmony, but an accurate record of a particular outcome. If the second promise is not kept, a new verifiable question appears. If no promise was made, it cannot be implied for a gentle ending. Recognition matters when words neither replace reality nor present an unresolved matter as agreement already achieved.

The initial distinction returns. An ethical opportunity to be heard does not mean entitlement to be right, obtain any decision, or hold another person in conversation. It means participation need not be bought with a convenient position, and words are considered in their own meaning. The substance of disagreement still needs examination. A person's dignity does not become a reward for a sound argument. When these lines are distinct, disagreement can remain serious while conversation is precise enough to avoid turning dissent into the speaker's disappearance.

What this means in practice

If the situation is calm and conversation voluntary, choose one recent disagreement and separate two questions on paper or in your mind. First: what proposal or claim was discussed? Second: what participation did you request—finishing a thought, correcting a restatement, contributing information before a decision? This is an editorial exercise in distinction, rather than a tested therapy or a duty to return to an argument. Where there are threats or fear of a response, it need not be done together; immediate danger and specialist help have separate routes.

Try naming one observable event for each line. For instance, the time was not changed; the explanation was interrupted after its first sentence. Then note what remains assumed: why someone interrupted, what they wanted, what they think of you in general. You need not erase a judgment, but it helps not to present it as an event already verified. If observations are insufficient, a question can remain open. There is no need to assemble an archive of grievances or prove that your record is the only possible history.

Now check the proposed request. Does it concern a result or an opportunity to convey its grounds? You can request consideration without demanding acceptance of the proposal in advance. You can reject a proposal while showing what you understood. If useful and safe, one such sentence can be clarified on your own. Sending it is optional. The other person may decline conversation; you may reject their conclusion. Neither precise wording nor an accurate restatement guarantees reciprocity or a fair decision.

You can end with one distinction rather than a new plan to correct everyone. Perhaps you will find that you were heard but did not get what you wanted. Perhaps you will see that the result was argued over instead of the question about participation. Perhaps you will recognise an unsuitable format. Any conclusion needs attention to circumstances. The modest task is to avoid turning understanding into agreement or disagreement into proof of absent dignity. That is enough to make the next question more accurate, even if its answer remains unknown.

Key quotation

> *a mode of associated living*

John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, Chapter VII, fragment of the definition of democracy. A social and philosophical context, not a guarantee of a conversation's outcome.

Connections between traditions

Dewey: exchange of experience in associated life ↔ the editorial distinction between participation and mandatory agreement. Educational philosophy does not become a clinically tested listening technique.

James 1:19–22: attention to hearing in religious life ↔ examining a hasty reply. The Christian foundation differs from democratic philosophy; no duty to endure threats follows.

Epictetus, paragraph 45: description and assessment ↔ distinguishing an event from an assumed motive. A Stoic limit on judgment does not erase harm or demand complete knowledge before protection.

Dewey ↔ Epictetus: conditions for exchanging experience and precision of one's judgment concern different levels. Group arrangements cannot be replaced with personal composure; personal precision does not resolve access.

Christian caution in speech ↔ Stoic caution in assessment: a limited resemblance in attention to one's response, with different foundations. No single traditional doctrine of a right to a voice is asserted.

Sources

1. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, Chapter VII. Work first published in 1916; Gutenberg 852, electronic update 16 June 2024. The version's precise printed basis was not established. Header and selected Chapter VII context read, rather than the whole book.

2. Epictetus, *Enchiridion*, paragraphs 44–46. Elizabeth Carter translation; precise printed basis not established. Attribution and selected paragraphs read; paragraph 45 used without direct quotation.

3. James 1, Updated World English Bible. Current chapter and publisher notice read; 1:19–22 used as religious teaching, rather than instructions for every conversation.

4. NHS, *Domestic violence and abuse*. Reviewed 23 June 2026. Selected sections on control, threats, help and leaving, plus review date read; linked pages and local availability not checked. British jurisdiction.

Tags

disagreement, argument, voice, participation, being heard, understanding, consent, refusal, attention, dignity, autonomy, boundaries, substance, reasons, assessment, observation, motive, reciprocity, conversational conditions, associated life, shared matters, personal choice, accessibility, safety, Dewey, Epictetus, Christian ethics, democracy, precision, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.